

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

The final paragraph of claim 1 has been amended, not to change the claim scope, but only to restate the structure recited therein, namely, that along at least a portion of tire between the crown and the bead, the first and second adjacent filaments extend in mutually parallel relationship. For example, in the embodiment according to Fig. 2 the parallel relationship between the filaments occurs in the region A-B. In figure 3; it occurs in the region A-C; and in Fig. 4 it occurs in region A-D.

Such a parallel relationship, which constitutes a novel physical characteristic of the finished tire, is made possible because the tire is formed directly on a toroidal drum. In the prior art, a tire component is first formed to a cylindrical shape on a cylindrical drum and then is reshaped to a toroid and eventually becomes a tire. Reinforcement filaments that may have been parallel in the cylindrical intermediate component lose their parallelism in the tire.

The claimed parallel structure enables a multifilament reinforcement to be produced economically. Also, the filaments can be placed very close together to increase the cord density.

In the Official action, the claims were rejected over the prior art, it being asserted that the features being relied upon for patentability, i.e., structure resulting from particular manufacturing method steps, are not recited in the claims. Applicant disagrees. The structural feature being relied upon is the parallel relationship between the filaments in the tire, and such a parallel relationship has been recited in the claims, which are directed to a tire. In the cited prior art, the parallel relationship

is disclosed in an intermediate component produced during manufacture of a tire, but not in the tire itself. As noted above, the parallelism of the filaments in the prior art is eliminated before the "tire" itself comes into being.

In conclusion, the present claims are directed to the tire, not to an intermediate component, and specifically recite a physical characteristic of the tire which is not in tires described in the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims are allowable. If the rejection is maintained, however, it is requested that an explanation be provided as to why it is felt that the novel features are not recited in the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 12, 2007

By:


Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 25813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620